

Remarks

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action of June 16, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration of **claims 1-20** is respectfully requested.

Summary of The Office Action

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wolf (U.S. Pat. No. 6,738,841).

The Present Claims Patentably Distinguish Over the References of Record

Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 is directed to a system comprising a printing device attached to a communication network where the printing device includes a control interface configured to allow a user to select a document and configured to cause the document to be retrieved from a remote device. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the control interface is configured to allow a user to interact with the printing device to select a document and configured to cause the document to be retrieved. No new matter has been added by way of this amendment. Support for this amendment can be found, among other places, in Figure 3 and pages 13 through 15.

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wolf. Wolf, however, does not disclose a control interface configured to allow a user to interact with the printing device to select a document and configured to cause the document to be retrieved from a remote device accessible via the communication network. Instead, the user in Wolf interacts with the client **210**, not the printing device, and the user requests documents for printing from the client **210**. Thus, the features of claim 1 are not shown by Wolf.

For example, the Office Action (at the top of page 3) states that the print server 255 of Wolf allows a user to select a document and to cause the document to be retrieved from a remote

device. Column 5, lines 33-49 were cited to support this position but the cited section states that the client **210** allows the user to select documents. Wolf states, “Client **210** requests documents from servers coupled to the network.” (column 5, lines 33-34). Wolf further clarifies that software on the client **210** acts as a user interface, “The client **210** may comprise a program (e.g. a browser) that permits a user to access documents over the network **200**...” (column 5, lines 34-35). Thus, the program on the client **210** allows a user to access documents, not the printer server. Wolf does not state that the printer server **255** allows the user to select a document as recited in claim 1.

Rather, Wolf teaches the printer server **255** as being used to process the print requests that are received from the client **210**. Wolf also calls the printer server a printer driver **255** (column 6, line 2). Starting at line 2 of column 6, Wolf describes that the printer server/driver **255** receives the request (from the client) and then can obtain the document, “...the user sends a request for the document to printer driver **255** within printer **250**. Printer driver **255** obtains the document from a server **220** or **230** and renders it...” Thus, documents are selected from the client **210**, not the printer server/driver **255**, and the client causes the printer server **255** to obtain the documents.

Figure 2 of Wolf clearly shows that the client **210** is not part of the printer **250** or the printer server **255**. The client **210** is a separate and remote device. Since the client **210** is used to select documents and it is separate from the printer **250**, the printer **250**, therefore, does not include a control interface configured to allow a user to interact with the printing device to select a document as recited by claim 1.

Therefore, Wolf fails to teach or suggest the claimed printing device that includes a control interface as recited in claim 1. Since claim 1 recites features not taught or suggested by Wolf, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Wolf. Accordingly, dependent **claims 2-10** also patentably distinguish over Wolf and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 11

Claim 11 has been amended to clarify that the user interacts directly with the printing device to cause the printing device to initiate a retrieval request for a selected document. No new matter has been added since Figure 3 and pages 13-15 of the present specification, for example, provide support.

The Office Action rejected claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wolf. Again, Wolf is directly converse to claim 11. As previously stated, the user in Wolf interacts directly with the client **210** to initiate a retrieval request for a document for printing, not the printing device, as recited by claim 11. Thus, Wolf does not disclose each and every element of present claim 11, either explicitly or implicitly.

Since claim 11 recites features not taught or suggested by Wolf, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Wolf. Accordingly, dependent **claims 12-17** also patentably distinguish over Wolf and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 18

Claim 18 is directed to a printing device for selecting and printing one or more documents comprising means for selecting and causing a document to be retrieved from a remote device where the means for selecting and causing is configured within the printing device, means for converting the selected document to printable format, and means for transferring the document to the printing device.

The Office Action rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wolf. As previously described, Wolf's printing device **250** is void of any sort of means for selecting and causing a document to be retrieved from a remote device, as recited by claim 18. The document to be printed in Wolf is selected by the client **210**, not the printing device **250**. The client **210** is a separate and remote device from the printer **250** and printer server **255** (see Figure 2). Thus, Wolf fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 18.

Therefore, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over Wolf and is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, dependent **claim 19** also patentably distinguishes over Wolf and is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 20

Claim 20 is directed to a printing device. Claim 20 has been amended to clarify the control interface for allowing a user to directly interact with the printing device to select a document and cause the document to be retrieved.

As previously described, the printer **250** or the printer server **255** of Wolf does not include a control interface for allowing a user to directly interact with the printing device to select a document, as recited by claim 20. As explained previously, Wolf teaches that a user selects a document from a client **210**. The client **210** is a separate and remote device from the printer **250** and printer server **255** (see Figure 2). Thus, Wolf does not teach or suggest the features of claim 20.

Since claim 20 recites features not taught or suggested by Wolf, claim 20 patentably distinguishes over Wolf.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, **claims 1-20** patentably and unobviously distinguish over the references of record and are now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SEPT. 16, 2005

Date



PETAR KRAGULJAC (Reg. No. 38,520)

(216) 348-5843